

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 01 2009

S/N 10/564,968

PATENTIN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	YUKAWA ET AL.	Examiner:	REDDY
Serial No.:	10/564,968	Group Art Unit:	1794
Filed:	JANUARY 18, 2006	Docket No.:	10873.1824USWO
Title:	RETROREFLECTIVE SHEET FOR SECURITY AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING THE SAME		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.6(d): I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 1, 2009

By: [Signature]
Name: Gina M. Dahl

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants provisionally elect Group I (claims 1 to 14) in response to the Restriction Requirement of June 4, 2009, with traverse. The restriction is justified on the grounds that Group 2 requires the glass beads to be emdedded in the binder layer where the print resin layer is formed, while Groups 1, 3 and 4 do not. However, claim 15, line 7 indicates that the glass beads are embedded in a part of the binder layer where the print resin layer is not formed. Similarly, claim 1 (Group 1) and claim 17 (Group 3) require that the glass beads are disposed in the binder layer at a position that does not correspond to the position of the print resin layer. Each of claims 1, 15 and 17 requires that the print resin layer is made of a composition containing a room temperature curing resin as a main component. Group 4 is directed to the method of making the item of claim 17, and thus likewise shares these features. Therefore, this does not justify the restriction. The restriction also is justified on Group 3 requiring a print layer having an affinity

S/N 10/564,968

PATENT

with a sublimable dye, while Group 1 requires a print layer comprising a room temperature curing resin. However, claim 1 requires a "print resin layer" that comprises the room temperature curing resin, which is different from the print layer, and Claim 17 also requires this print resin layer. Moreover, claim 8 of Group 1 requires the presence of an image formation layer that corresponds to the print layer of Group 3. The restriction also is justified on Group 4 requiring a transfer paper while Group 1 does not. However, Group 1 is directed to a product and Group 4 is directed to a method. The transfer paper is part of an intermediate stage of production, and thus it is understandable that it would not be found in the product. In fact, the transfer paper is indicated as being removed during the method of claim 19.

Applicants therefore submit that no adequate basis has been established for the restriction requirement, and request that it be withdrawn. An early and favorable action on the merits is requested.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account
No. 50-3478.

Respectfully submitted,

Hamre, Schumann,
Mueller & Larson, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
Phone: 612-455-3800

Date: 2/11/2009By 

Name: Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
Customer No. 52835